

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

* * *

ANGELA ZIVE, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

**GEICO ADVANTAGE INSURANCE
COMPANY,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:24-CV-00424-ART-CLB

**ORDER GRANTING SUA SPONTE
EXTENSION TO FILE A RESPONSE TO
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REGARDING
DISCOVERY DISPUTE**

[ECF No. 14]

On November 25, 2024, Plaintiff filed a “Motion Regarding Discovery Dispute,” (ECF No. 14), in compliance with the undersigned Magistrate Judge’s Standing Order. (ECF No. 11.) Pursuant to the Standing Order, Plaintiff was required to file a response “no later than 2 court days after the initial motion” was filed. (*Id.* at 4.) Therefore, Defendant’s response was due by no later than December 2, 2024. However, to date, Defendant has failed to file any response or opposition to Plaintiff’s motion.¹ Therefore, the Court *sua sponte* grants one extension to file a response or opposition to the motion by no later than Friday, December 6, 2024, at 5:00 p.m.² Failure to file a response or opposition to the motion by this date may result in the Court granting Plaintiff’s motion, in its entirety, as unopposed. No further extensions of time will be granted.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: December 3, 2024

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ Rather than file an opposition to Plaintiff's Motion, it appears Defendant filed a motion to stay discovery. (ECF No. 15.) However, this does not constitute an opposition to Plaintiff's Motion and the Court will not construe it as such.

² Defendant is advised that any opposition filed to Plaintiff's Motion should address the substantive arguments raised in the motion and not simply assert that the motion should be denied because discovery should be stayed.